

BEFORE THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
ENERGY FACILITY SITE EVALUATION COUNCIL

IN RE APPLICATION NO. 99-1

EXHIBIT _____(KC-T)

SUMAS ENERGY 2 GENERATION
FACILITY

APPLICANT'S PREFILED DIRECT TESTIMONY

WITNESS # 3: KATY CHANEY

REVISED 6/21/200

Q. Please introduce yourself to the Council.

A. My name is Katy Chaney. I am Manager of Pacific Northwest Environmental Services at Dames & Moore in Seattle. I have been with Dames & Moore since 1989, where I was a Senior Project Manager and Unit Leader for Land Use and General Planning before being promoted to my current position. As Manager of Pacific Northwest Environmental Services, I manage environmental permitting efforts, environmental assessments, environmental impact statements, land use, energy and natural resource compliance evaluations, air quality, noise, planning and siting studies, and assistance with land use, shoreline and construction permits.

EXHIBIT _____(KC-T) – REVISED 6/21/00
KATY CHANEY'S
PREFILED TESTIMONY - 1

[31742-0001/Chaney Revised.doc SL003721-500]

PERKINS COIE LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, Washington 98101-3099
(206) 583-8888

1
2
3 Prior to joining Dames & Moore, I was Director of the Land Use division of the City
4 of Seattle's Department of Construction and Land Use. My educational and
5 professional background is described in greater detail on my resume, which is provided
6 as Exhibit ____ (KC-1).
7
8
9
10
11

12 **Q. What is the subject of your testimony?**

13
14
15 A. My direct testimony is intended to address the following subjects:

16 First, I will briefly provide some background information regarding Dames & Moore
17 and I will describe the firm's experience with environmental assessments and energy
18 facility siting proceedings.
19
20

21
22 Second, I will describe the environmental analysis that has been conducted in
23 connection with the Application for the Sumas Energy 2 Generation Facility.
24

25 Third, I will describe the environmental impacts expected to occur as a result of the
26 Sumas Energy 2 Generation Facility and the measures that have been proposed to
27 mitigate those impacts.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 **Background**

36
37 **Q. What sort of business is Dames and Moore?**

38
39 A. Dames & Moore was founded in 1938 as a geotechnical consulting firm. In June
40 1999, Dames & Moore was acquired by the URS Corporation. URS provides general
41 engineering and consulting, transportation, process/chemical engineering; construction
42 services; and specialty engineering and consulting. Headquartered in San Francisco,
43 the company operates in 38 countries and is staffed by over 16,000 employees.
44
45
46
47

EXHIBIT ____ (KC-T) – REVISED 6/21/00

KATY CHANEY'S
PREFILED TESTIMONY - 2

[31742-0001/Chaney Revised.doc SL003721-500]

PERKINS COIE LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, Washington 98101-3099
(206) 583-8888

1 URS/Dames and Moore specializes in facility siting investigations, environmental
2 baseline and impact assessments, environmental studies, engineering, and applied earth
3 sciences. Dames & Moore has served more than 35,000 clients, including federal,
4 state and local governments as well as eighty percent of the leading corporations in the
5 United States.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 **Q. Describe Dames & Moore's experience with power plants?**

14 **A.** Dames & Moore has worked on hundreds of power plant projects in the United
15 States, providing environmental and engineering services in connection with power
16 plant construction, licensing and operation.
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Q. What is Dames & Moore's experience with EFSEC applications?**

23 **A.** In addition to the Sumas Energy 2 application, Dames & Moore has prepared five
24 other EFSEC applications: (1) Application 96-1 for the Cross Cascade Pipeline
25 Project; (2) Application 94-1 for the Satsop Combustion Turbine Project; (3)
26 Application 94-2 for the Chehalis Generation Facility; (4) Application 93-1 for the
27 Cowlitz Cogeneration Project; and (5) Application 92-1 for the Trans Mountain
28 Pipeline. The Cross Cascade Pipeline application was withdrawn by Olympic Pipe
29 Line, and the applicant for the Trans Mountain Pipeline decided not to file the
30 application. The three power projects have been recommended by EFSEC and
31 approved by the Governor of the State of Washington.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Q. What was your role in the previous five applications?**
46
47

1 A. I served as Dames and Moore's Project Manager for all five of the applications. In
2 that capacity, I had primary responsibility for drafting the applications and supervising
3 the team of engineers and technical experts who performed the environmental analysis.
4 I worked with state agencies and local jurisdictions to reach stipulated agreements
5 resolving their environmental concerns. I also testified as an expert witness on behalf
6 of the four projects that proceeded to adjudicatory hearings.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 **Analysis of Environmental Impacts**

16
17 **Q. Please describe in general terms the analysis that has been conducted to assess**
18 **the environmental impacts of the Sumas Energy 2 (SE2) Generation Facility**
19 **project.**
20
21

22
23 A. The SE2 project is the construction and operation of a 660 MW combined cycle
24 combustion turbine power plant on an approximately 37-acre site in Sumas,
25 Washington. The project also involves the construction of a 4.5 mile natural gas
26 pipeline and a 0.5 mile section of 230-kV electrical transmission lines running north
27 from the site to the Canadian border. The transmission lines continue north for an
28 approximate total distance of 5.9 miles to connect to B.C. Hydro's Clayburn Station in
29 British Columbia.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 The project site, natural gas line corridor, and the electrical transmission line corridor
40 have all been surveyed by biologists, planners, and cultural and historical resource
41 scientists. Wetlands delineations of the S2GF site and the natural gas pipeline were
42 first conducted by David Evans and Associates in 1992, and ~~resurveyed~~ reviewed in
43 1998 and 1999 by Bexar Environmental Consulting Ltd., and resurveyed by Bexar in
44
45
46
47

1 2000 using the 1987 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual.

2 The results of these delineations have been confirmed by the Natural Resource
3 Conservation Service (NRCS). During 1998 and 1999, Bexar also surveyed the
4 wetlands along the electrical transmission line, and has made numerous visits to the
5 site as part of developing the wetlands mitigation plan. Bexar has also prepared a
6 wetlands functions and categorization assessment for all project facilities using the
7 Washington Department of Ecology Draft Wetland Characterization Manual.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15
16 Wildlife and fisheries surveys were conducted in September 1998 as part of preparing
17 the January 1999 Application. Other than drainage, there is no open water on site.
18 The natural gas pipeline will cross under three water bodies (the Sumas River and two
19 creeks), and will be drilled under the stream beds to prevent any impacts to aquatic
20 resources.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 The powerplant portion of the site was surveyed for cultural and historical resources in
29 1995. This survey work was expanded in 1998 to add the remainder of the 37-acre
30 site, the natural gas pipeline and the electrical transmission line.
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 A number of water studies have been performed for the site and the surrounding area
38 by David Evans and Associates, Robinson and Noble, and KCM including the pump
39 test information that is included as an appendix to the Application and the flood plain
40 analysis performed by KCM.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1 Subsurface geology and geotechnical conditions for the site and the surrounding
2 vicinity were investigated in 1995 by GeoEngineers. This investigation included the
3 drilling of seven boreholes and the installation of three groundwater monitoring wells.
4
5
6

7
8 The site and the surrounding area were also surveyed by a land use planner in the fall
9 of 1998, and then by a landscape architect in 1999 as part of preparing visual
10 simulations for the revised Application.
11
12
13

14
15 The description of the extensive work done on air quality and noise is included in the
16 testimony of Eric Hansen.
17
18
19
20

21
22 **Q. What was Dames & Moore's role in this work.**
23

24 **A.** In mid-1998, SE2 engaged Dames & Moore to prepare the Application for Site
25 Certification for the Sumas Energy 2 Generation Facility (S2GF), originally filed with
26 the Council in January 1999, as well as updated pages filed with the Council in January
27 2000. I will refer to the updated Application simply as "the Application." (Exhibit
28 _____).
29
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 In preparing the Application, Dames & Moore has conducted field work and studies
37 on geology and soils, vegetation, wildlife and wildlife habitat, aquatic resources, land
38 use, socioeconomics, public services, recreation, and visual resources. Dames &
39 Moore also managed and/or coordinated the technical work for the application
40 performed by other consultants. As of March 31, 2000, Dames & Moore has spent
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1 more than 3,000 hours in gathering data, working in the field, preparing the
2 Application and meeting with local, state and federal agencies.
3
4 Key members of the Dames & Moore project team included Mark Molinari, Roy
5 Elliott, David Every, Robert Neilsen, and Robert Mott and myself. Resumes of the
6 team members are provided as Exhibit ____ (KC-2)
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 **Q. Who were the other consultants working on the project?**

14
15 A. Several other consulting firms played a significant role in analyzing some of the issues
16 associated with this project. McCulley Frick & Gilman addressed air emissions and
17 sound issues. Two firms – Robinson & Noble and David Evans & Associates –
18 addressed water resource issues. Bexar Environmental Consulting addressed wetland
19 issues. Historical Research Associates addressed cultural resource issues.
20 Transportation Solutions Inc. addressed traffic and transportation issues.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 **Q. In addition to preparing the Application for Site Certification, has SE2 applied**
30 **for or obtained other permits relating to this project?**
31

32
33 A. Yes. In addition to the Application for Site Certification filed with EFSEC, SE2 has
34 filed applications for several other permits related to this project:
35
36
37

38
39 (1) SE2 has filed a notice of intent to be covered by two nationwide permits issued by
40 the United States Corps of Engineers authorizing the filling of wetlands pursuant to
41 Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. This was approved by the Army Corps of
42 Engineers. In connection with these permits, SE2 has developed a detailed Wetland
43 Mitigation Plan, copy of which is provided as Appendix ~~A-C-8~~ to the Application.
44
45
46
47

EXHIBIT ____ (KC-T) – REVISED 6/21/00

KATY CHANEY'S
PREFILED TESTIMONY - 7

[31742-0001/Chaney Revised.doc SL003721-500]

PERKINS COIE LLP
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, Washington 98101-3099
(206) 583-8888

1 SE2 is working closely with the Corps of Engineers to obtain approval of the
2 mitigation plan.
3
4

5
6 (2) SE2 has applied for Presidential Permits authorizing the border crossing of the
7 natural gas pipeline and the electric transmission line. In connection with these
8 permits, the Department of Energy's Office of Fossil Energy (OFE) is the lead agency
9 preparing an Environmental Assessment in compliance with the National
10 Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). We are in the process of submitting additional
11 information, in response to comments from OFE, for their NEPA Environmental
12 Assessment. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) issued SE2 a
13 Presidential Permit authorizing the pipeline crossing on December 22, 1999.
14
15

16
17 (3) SE2 has also applied to the Canadian National Energy Board (NEB) to obtain the
18 necessary approvals to construct the proposed 230 kV transmission line from the U.S.-
19 Canada border to BCHydro's Clayburn station located near Abbotsford, British
20 Columbia, and for a Gas Export License to permit the exportation of natural gas from
21 Canada to the U.S.. The Canadian Ministry of the Environment is conducting its own
22 environmental review process regarding that aspect of the project, and a Canadian
23 Environmental Assessment, prepared much in the same manner as would be required
24 under NEPA, is under review by the NEB.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

Environmental Impacts

43
44
45 **Q. Describe the environmental impacts of the project, leaving aside the natural gas**
46 **pipeline and the electrical transmission lines for now.**
47

1 A. The Application discusses the impacts of the project on all elements of the
2 environment. The principal environmental areas addressed in the Application are
3 water supply, water quality, flood control, air quality, noise, plants and animals,
4 socioeconomics, land use, and visual impacts.
5
6
7
8
9

10 **Q. What are the water needs for the project and how will these needs be met?**
11

12 A. Sections 2.5 and 3.3 of the Application address water supply issues. The water use
13 plan developed by SE2 is structured to minimize water consumption by using a
14 combination wet/dry cooling system. No water is used for cooling when ambient air
15 temperatures are below 29°F. In negotiations with the City of Sumas subsequent to
16 filing the Application, SE2 has agreed to use a small reverse osmosis (RO) treatment
17 unit to reduce waste water flow, and the use of this unit will also reduce the amount of
18 water needed to operate the facility. The annual average water demand will be
19 approximately 635 gpm. The peak water demand is 849 will be approximately 760
20 gallons per minute, which occurs when ambient air temperatures exceed 59°F.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 SE2 will purchase water from the City of Sumas. The City has already issued a
33 Certificate of Water Availability to the project, a copy of which is included in
34 Appendix A-3 of the Application. Prior to agreeing to provide water for the S2GF,
35 the City determined that this water could be provided without exceeding the City's
36 combined maximum instantaneous water right withdrawal limit of 3,611 gpm. The
37 issue water supply is addressed in greater detail in the testimony of Burt Clothier from
38 Robinson & Noble.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1 **Q. Does the project require any new water rights?**

2
3 A. No. S2GF will not require the expansion of any existing water right or a new water
4 right. The existing wells at the Sumas municipal well field are capable of withdrawing
5 water near, or in excess of, their water right limits. The May Road well field will
6 require one or two additional wells to maximize use of the existing water rights.
7
8 These wells can be installed under the existing water right (see Appendix ~~C~~A-3 of the
9 Application).
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 **Q. How will wastewater from the facility be handled?**

17
18 A. Wastewater will be transported to the City of Sumas sewer system, which is connected
19 to the Abbotsford sewer system. At the time it filed its Application, SE2 estimated the
20 The maximum wastewater discharge will to be 256 gpm. On November 22, 1999, the
21 City of Sumas had issued a certificate to SE2 agreeing to accept up to 260 gpm of
22 wastewater from the project (see Appendix C of the Application). In recent
23 negotiations with the City of Sumas, SE2 has agreed to substantially reduce its waste
24 water flow by installing a small reverse osmosis (RO) treatment unit on site. Using the
25 RO system, the monthly average waste water flow will range from 17-27 gpm, or
26 24,480 – 38,880 gallons per day. In the context of negotiating a stipulation, the City
27 has agreed to allow the Sumas Cogeneration Company, L.P. to transfer a portion of its
28 80,000 gallons per day sewer capacity contract to SE2. Because the Sumas
29 Cogeneration Company facility is capable of reducing its waste water flow to
30 approximately 30,000 gallons per day, there is sufficient capacity remaining to
31 accommodate SE2's waste water flow. No amendment of the Sumas-Abbotsford
32 waste water treatment contract will be necessary.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

EXHIBIT ____ (KC-T) – REVISED 6/21/00

KATY CHANEY'S

PREFILED TESTIMONY - 10

[31742-0001/Chaney Revised.doc SL003721-500]

PERKINS COIE LLP

1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, Washington 98101-3099
(206) 583-8888

1
2
3 **Q. Will the facility have any effect on surface water quality in the surrounding**
4 **area?**
5

6
7 A. No. Sections 2.10 and 3.3 of the Application address surface water issues in detail.
8
9

10
11 During construction of the facility, mitigation measures will be designed to prevent
12 erosion and silt runoff into nearby surface waters. These mitigation measures will
13 include silt fencing, sediment traps, erosion control blankets, and a runoff detention
14 pond.
15
16
17

18
19
20 During operation, the facility should not adversely affect surface water quality in the
21 area. As I explained previously, process wastewater will be discharged to the City of
22 Sumas sewer system and ultimately treated at the regional wastewater treatment plant
23 in Abbotsford, British Columbia. The facility will develop a Stormwater Pollution
24 Prevent Plan, and will maintain a stormwater detention and treatment system on site.
25 Containment areas and best management practices will also be used to prevent
26 chemicals and fuels used and stored on the site from mixing with stormwater runoff.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Q. Will the facility have any effect on ground water quality in the area?**
37

38 A. No. As I explained, the process waste water will be treated off site, and extensive
39 precautions will be taken to prevent the release of fuels and chemicals stored on site.
40 It is also important to note that the facility will be located on low-permeability clay
41 soil, approximately a half mile from the unconfined portion of the aquifer. As a result,
42
43
44
45
46
47

1 there is little chance that any inadvertent release would contaminate local
2 groundwater.
3
4
5

6 **Q. Does the project require any filling of the site, and if so, will it affect the**
7 **floodplain?**
8
9

10 A. As described in Section 2.15 of the Application, the site lies within the 100-year flood
11 plain of Sumas and Johnson Creeks in a nearly flat area that includes wetlands and
12 historic drainage routes. A study of the flood plain and the related mapping indicates
13 that the 100-year base flood level is approximately 42.5 feet, plus or minus 0.5 feet in
14 the vicinity of the project. The site finished grade will range from approximately 44.0
15 feet to 46.0 feet. Approximately 130,000 cubic yards of fill material will be needed for
16 the structural fill at the site.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25
26 The proposed fill is consistent with local requirements. The Sumas flood ordinance
27 and the Whatcom County ordinance allows fills within the 100-year floodplain. The
28 City of Sumas developed a Flood Management Plan in 1997, which authorizes the
29 industrial area surrounding the S2GF site to be filled. The City's consultant evaluated
30 the impact of filling this much larger area and concluded that the largest impact during
31 a 100-year flood would occur south and southwest of the facility, and would be no
32 more than 10 inches. Because the fill proposed by SE2 is much smaller, the impact
33 during a 100-year flood is also expected to be much smaller.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Q. Can you summarize the air quality impacts?**
45
46
47

1 A. Air quality impacts and emissions are discussed in Sections 2.11, 3.2 and 6.1 of the
2 Application. The combustion turbine combined cycle units will incorporate Best
3 Available Control Technologies (BACT). Atmospheric emissions will comply with all
4 applicable federal and state air quality regulations. The S2GF will be fueled primarily
5 by natural gas, ~~but~~ SE2 is also seeking permission to use very low sulfur distillate oil
6 for up to 15 days a year, but has agreed to limit its use of distillate oil to no more than
7 an average of 10 days a year over a 10 year period. The flexibility to use distillate oil
8 for short periods will allow SE2 to free up natural gas supplies to supply residential
9 uses during cold snaps.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 Natural gas is a relatively clean burning fuel that produces lower emissions of nitrogen
21 oxides, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide and particulate matter than
22 other fossil fuels. The high efficiency combined-cycle design of the SE2 facility will
23 also allow more electricity to be generated with less fuel, and therefore, with lower
24 emissions than a conventional power plant.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 The SE2 facility will utilize the Best Available Control Technology (BACT) to limit air
32 emissions and comply with all federal and state regulatory requirements.
33
34
35
36
37

38 A Selective Catalytic Reduction (SCR) system will be used to limit emissions of
39 nitrogen oxides (NOx) to ~~3-2~~ 3-2 ppm during natural gas firing and ~~12-6~~ 12-6 ppm during oil
40 firing. These emission levels are substantially lower than emission control levels
41 identified for two similar natural gas fired power plants recently permitted in
42 Washington.
43
44
45
46
47

1
2
3 An oxidation catalyst will be used to limit carbon monoxide emissions to 2 ppm during
4 gas firing and 12 ppm during oil firing. This is equal to or better than emissions rates
5 approved for the most recent similar plants in Washington.
6
7

8
9
10 Emissions of sulfur dioxide (SO₂) will be only 1 ppm during natural gas firing, and 10
11 ppm during oil firing.
12
13

14
15
16 As part of the environmental review of the proposed project, SE2's consultants at
17 MFG, Inc. have conducted some of the most extensive air quality modeling analysis
18 ever conducted in the Pacific Northwest. EPA's dispersion model demonstrated that
19 pollutant concentrations attributable to the SE2 facility will be far below regulatory
20 limits. A sophisticated regional air quality modeling study demonstrated that normal
21 operations of the facility would not affect regional visibility in Class I areas such as
22 North Cascades and Olympic National Parks.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31
32 The high efficiency design of the SE2 facility will also minimize the emission of so-
33 called "greenhouse" gases. Although greenhouse gas emissions are not regulated by
34 federal or state law, SE2 proposes to make a substantial voluntary investment of \$1
35 million in greenhouse gas mitigation projects.
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Eric Hansen's testimony discusses air quality in more detail.
43
44
45
46
47

Q. What will be the sound levels coming from the project?

EXHIBIT _____ (KC-T) – REVISED 6/21/00

KATY CHANEY'S

PREFILED TESTIMONY - 14

[31742-0001/Chaney Revised.doc SL003721-500]

PERKINS COIE LLP

1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, Washington 98101-3099
(206) 583-8888

1 A. Noise impacts are discussed in Section 4.1 of the Application. The S2GF has been
2 designed to minimize sound emissions and to meet the City's noise limits of 50 dBA at
3 residential property lines at night. The facility will be located at a site in Sumas'
4 industrial area, and the site layout itself is designed to minimize impacts to nearby
5 residents. SE2 has also included extensive sound abatement measures in the facility
6 design. Among other things, turbines and generators will be enclosed in an insulated
7 building, sound attenuation technologies will be used in the heat recovery steam
8 generators and exhaust stacks, and sound barriers will be erected on the north side of
9 the transformers. EPA Region 10 guidelines evaluate increase in sound levels above
10 existing conditions using the following criteria: (a) an increase of 0 to 5 dBA is
11 considered a slight impact; (b) an increase of 5 to 10 dBA is considered a significant
12 impact; and (c) an ~~increase~~ increase of greater than 10 dBA is considered a very serious
13 impact. A number of noise mitigation measures have been included in the project to
14 reduce the noise levels, including putting the turbines in a building and using sound-
15 deadening materials. When both units of the S2GF are operating at 100% of capacity,
16 sound levels at the residential properties near the site will cumulatively increase from 1
17 to 4 dBA. Under the EPA guidelines, this would be considered a slight impact. The
18 sound from the plant will not exceed the City's nighttime limit of 50 dBA as measured
19 at the residential property line.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 **Q. Will the use of the site affect wetlands or wildlife habitat?**

42 A. The entire site is approximately 37 acres. Approximately 20 acres of the site will be
43 developed for the facility. This 20-acre portion has historically been used for
44 agriculture, with corn being the most recent crop. Within the 20-acre portion, there is
45
46
47

1 approximately 0.9 acre of farmed wetland pasture and approximately 1 acre of wetland
2 ditch, both of which will be filled as part of the development. The wetland ditch
3 contains mostly reed canary grass and barnyard grass.
4
5
6

7
8 [Please note: The following paragraph was based on the wetland mitigation proposal
9 filed with the Application. Negotiations regarding wetland mitigation are on-going,
10 and therefore, the following numbers may change prior to the adjudicatory hearing.]
11

12 In order to compensate for the loss of this relatively low quality wetlands, SE2
13 proposes to create, enhance and preserve a total of 11.46 acres. SE2 will create
14 approximately 1.5 acres of new wetland by lowering the existing ground elevation in
15 an area approximately 700-feet wide by 120-feet, and then planting the area with
16 native shrubs and trees. SE2 will enhance approximately 0.56-acres of farmed wetland
17 pasture by planting it with native shrubs and trees. SE2 will also preserve
18 approximately 9.4 acres of wetlands on the western portion of the site. The 9.4 acres
19 is made up of 8.8-acres of palustrine shrub area with palustrine forested areas and 0.6-
20 acre palustrine emergent fringe. The 9.4-acre wetland is adjacent to the area proposed
21 for new or enhanced wetland. The entire area of 11.46-acres of wetland will be either
22 dedicated to the City of Sumas for permanent open space or placed into a conservation
23 easement. A minimum of 25 feet of enhanced buffers will be provided around the
24 wetland area to protect the habitat. A diagram showing the site and the wetland
25 mitigation area is attached as Exhibit ____ (KC-3)
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 A Dames & Moore biologist surveyed the site in September 1998 for wildlife use. The
46 forested wetland area has perching trees for birds and provides cover or foraging areas
47

1 for small mammals and amphibians. This area will be protected and increased through
2 the creation of additional wetland area. The 20-acre portion to be developed for the
3 facility is clear of vegetation and has been used for seasonal crops. Because of the
4 agricultural use, there will be limited impacts to wildlife. Small mammals such as voles
5 or field mice use the reed canary grass as habitat.
6
7
8
9
10

11
12 **Q. Will any unique species be affected by the development of the site?**

13
14 A. No, as described in Section 3.4.5 of the Application, Dames & Moore wildlife and
15 fisheries biologists surveyed the 37-acre for federal status species and state priority
16 species and habitats in September 1998. Bald eagles nest and forage along streams
17 and rivers in the Sumas area approximately one mile east of the plant site, and will not
18 be affected by construction or operation. No other unique species or habitats will be
19 affected by the development.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 **Q. What are the socioeconomic of the project?**

29
30 A. Socioeconomic impacts from the project will be positive. They are described in
31 Section 8.1 of the Application. The construction workforce will average 200 for an
32 18-month period, and will peak at approximately 400 workers for a period of 4
33 months. It is estimated that 65 percent of these workers will be hired locally from
34 Whatcom, Skagit or Snohomish Counties. Total payroll costs for the project,
35 including fringe benefits and other labor overhead costs, are projected at \$30.6 million,
36 of which approximately \$11 million is expected to be expended in Whatcom County.
37 Local non-salary costs for construction materials, services and equipment leasing is
38 estimated to be \$22 million.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1
2
3 After completion, the value of the project will be approximately \$385 million in 1999
4 dollars. Operation of the S2GF will require approximately 23 full-time employees,
5 plus 10-30 part-time contractors or employees who will perform maintenance work at
6 the site. The estimated direct payroll for the permanent workforce is \$1.35 million.
7
8 Another \$1.2 million would be spent on purchases from suppliers (including fuels,
9 maintenance supplies and services, retail goods and professional services). Sales, use
10 and indirect business taxes are estimated at \$1.78 million per year.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 **Q. What are the land use impacts of the project?**

20 A. Land use impacts are discussed in Section 5.1 of the Application. The site is located in
21 an industrial zone within the City limits, and the City of Sumas testified at the land use
22 consistency hearing that the project is a permitted use in the Industrial zoning district.
23 The site is within a larger industrially-zoned area that includes both other industrial
24 uses and farmlands. (A diagram of the site and the surrounding area is provided as
25 Exhibit ____ (KC-4).) The IKO Pacific Inc. plant (an asphalt shingle plant) and Valley
26 Plumbing and Electrical Appliance are located to the west. East across Bob Mitchell
27 Avenue are Woodstone (stone-fired cooking equipment), Cover All Shelter Systems,
28 American Wood Treaters (appears to be abandoned), and Desticon Transportation
29 Inc. (lumber transport). To the south across Highway 9 is Socco Forest Products, the
30 Sumas Cogeneration Company, and Dentech and Elenbaas Company (manufacturer of
31 dental chairs). North of the site is an undeveloped industrial site (agricultural fields
32 and trees) and Burlington Northern Railroad. A dairy farm is located north of the
33 railroad.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1
2
3 **Q. What are the visual impacts of the project?**

4
5 A. The S2GF will be located within an industrial area that is currently undergoing a
6 transition from farmlands to industrial buildings. The construction will represent a
7 change in the view from residents located to the north and drivers along State
8 Highway 9 and Bob Mitchell Avenue. We have included a number of photo
9 simulations in Section 5.1 of the Application to show the existing viewpoints, and the
10 simulated view of the facility without and with landscape mitigation. SE2 is
11 committed to retaining existing trees wherever possible and to planting large-sized
12 native species trees to mitigate the view of the plant. They also plan to plant fast-
13 growing trees such as poplars to expedite the development of a mature vegetation
14 screen. The project components, including the emission stacks, will be painted in
15 earth-tones to minimize contrast with the sky and surrounding area. As described in
16 Section 3.2 of the Application, visible plumes from the wet/dry cooling system will
17 occur but will usually be short. During periods of good visibility, condensed plumes
18 will be less than 50 meters in length on average.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Q. What are the impacts of the natural gas pipeline?**

36
37 A. The S2GF will use approximately 109 Mcf/day of natural gas to fuel the gas turbines.
38 The natural gas will be produced in Canada and delivered by West Coast Pipeline Ltd.
39 to the United States-Canadian border approximately one mile east of Sumas. A
40 pipeline currently delivers natural gas to the Sumas Cogeneration Facility located just
41 south of the SE2 project site. A new 4.25 mile long 16-inch natural gas line will be
42 constructed parallel to that line to supply natural gas to the proposed facility. The
43
44
45
46
47

1 pipeline will be drilled under the Sumas River and creeks which will be crossed by the
2 pipeline to protect the water quality and the aquatic habitats.
3
4

5
6 Installation of the pipeline will cause some temporary disturbance of agricultural
7 croplands and agricultural grasslands located within the existing pipeline right-of-way.
8
9 The pipeline will be placed deep enough to allow agricultural activities to resume over
10 the pipeline. There would also be temporary impacts to approximately 0.6 acres of
11
12 palustrine emergent wetlands and one small palustrine scrub shrub wetland. Most of
13
14 the disturbance would be in agricultural areas maintained as hayed pasture or as corn
15
16 cropland during the 1999 growing season. All wetlands disturbed during the
17
18 installation of the pipeline will be graded to pre-project contours that will allow
19
20 existing wetland conditions and agricultural activities to re-establish.
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 Although the existing natural gas line has been operating safely for many years, SE2
28 understands the safety concerns that accompany pipeline proposals. SE2 will design,
29
30 construct and operate the proposed natural gas pipeline in accordance with all federal
31
32 and state regulations, and will exceed those regulatory requirements in many respects.
33
34 Ted Potter's testimony addresses these issues in greater detail.
35
36
37
38

39 **Q. What are the impacts of the electrical transmission lines?**

40
41 A. First, I would like to reiterate that the only electrical transmission lines that are part of
42
43 this Application are the 230 kV lines that will cross the U.S. – Canadian border,
44
45 connecting the facility to B.C. Hydro's Clayburn Station. SE2 has no plans to
46
47 construct transmission lines across Whatcom County and, as far as we know, no other

1 utility is currently proposing to build such lines. If another utility did decide to
2 purchase power from SE2 and to transmit it directly through the County, that utility
3 would need to go through a separate environmental review and permitting process
4 before constructing transmission lines in the county. EFSEC's DEIS examines the
5 impacts of two Whatcom County routes as potential future actions, but there is
6 currently no proposal to construct such routes.
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 SE2 proposes to connect the plant to the Canadian electric grid by constructing a new
15 5.9 mile transmission line from the facility to BC Hydro's Clayburn substation. The
16 new transmission line will parallel Bob Mitchell Avenue and an existing railroad
17 corridor in the City of Sumas. There will be eleven new transmission poles, as shown
18 on Figure 2.4-1 in Section 2.4 of the Application. Typically, the transmission line
19 poles will be placed on road shoulders to facilitate maintenance and to avoid direct
20 impacts on wetlands and along Sumas Creek. One pole may be located at the
21 northeast edge of an existing palustrine scrub shrub wetland. The impact would be
22 less than 0.1 acre. This wetland is also the subject of an unrelated construction
23 activity for which approval to fill the wetland is currently under review by the U.S.
24 Army Corps of Engineers. If the Corps permit process is completed and the unrelated
25 project construction fills the wetland, no impacts on wetlands will occur from the
26 installation of the transmission poles.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 Emissions generated by the 230 kV lines would be amplitude-modulated (AM) and
43 would not interfere with incoming frequency-modulated (FM) television signals or the
44 City's incoming FM cable television signal from a satellite. In addition, the S2GF
45
46
47

1 substation and transmission lines are well outside of the transmission path of the City's
2 FM television signals. The FM television signals are highly directional. Based on the
3 distance of the antennas above the horizon, there would not be an occasion for the 230
4 kV transmission line to directly interfere with the television transmission path.
5
6
7
8
9

10 **END OF DIRECT TESTIMONY**
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

EXHIBIT _____ (KC-T) – REVISED 6/21/00

KATY CHANEY'S

PREFILED TESTIMONY - 22

[31742-0001/Chaney Revised.doc SL003721-500]

PERKINS COIE LLP

1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, Washington 98101-3099
(206) 583-8888